UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/521,630	01/19/2005	Eiji Ueda	10873.1556USWO	4212
53148 7590 04/22/2008 HAMRE, SCHUMANN, MUELLER & LARSON P.C. P.O. BOX 2902-0902			EXAMINER	
			NGUYEN, LINH THI	
MINNEAPOLI	MINNEAPOLIS, MN 55402		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2627	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			04/22/2008	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)					
Office Action Comments	10/521,630	UEDA ET AL.					
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit					
	LINH T. NGUYEN	2627					
The MAILING DATE of this communication app Period for Reply	ears on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence ad	ldress				
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).							
Status							
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 28 Fe	hruary 2008						
	action is non-final.						
·=							
	closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.						
ologica in absordance with the practice ander E	x parte gadyle, 1000 C.B. 11, 40	0.0.210.					
Disposition of Claims							
4) Claim(s) 1-12 is/are pending in the application.							
4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdraw	4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration.						
5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.							
6)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1,2,5-8,11 and 12</u> is/are rejected.							
7) Claim(s) <u>3, 4, 9, and 10</u> is/are objected to.	·						
8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or	election requirement.						
<i>,</i>	·						
Application Papers							
9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.							
10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a)☐ acce	epted or b) \square objected to by the E	Examiner.					
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).							
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).							
11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.							
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119							
 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents 2. Certified copies of the priority documents 3. Copies of the certified copies of the prior application from the International Bureau * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of 	s have been received. s have been received in Application ity documents have been received (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	on No ed in this National	Stage				
Attachment(s) 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date	4) Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail Da 5) Notice of Informal P 6) Other:	ite					

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1, 2, 5-8, 11 and 12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kaneko et al (US Patent Number 5471449) in view of Osakabe (US Patent number 5872763).

In regards to claims 1 and 7, Kaneko et al discloses a deficiency detecting apparatus (Fig. 1), which detects deficiencies on an information medium that are unable to be recorded or reproduced when an information signal is recorded/reproduced with respect to the information medium using a light beam generated by a laser light source (Column 2 lines 14-20), comprising: a power adjusting section (APC) for adjusting an emitting power of the laser light source to an optimum value (Column 3, lines 56-60); and a deficiency detecting section for comparing a threshold (reference) value (Fig. 1, element 55).

In the same field of endeavor, Osakabe discloses a threshold hold value (the threshold value is the optimum recording laser value Pwo, Peo, or Pbo) determined by calculating a non-fixed variable value that varies depending on the emitting power of the laser light source (Fig. 1, element 16) adjusted by the power adjusting section (Column 3, lines 35-39) with a value corresponding to reflected light that is the light beam

reflected by an information layer of the information medium (Fig. 1, element 36 and Column 4, lines 1-25). At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to combine the defect detection by comparing a threshold value of Kaneko et al by using the threshold value that is determine by the varies depending on the emitting power as suggested by Osakabe. The motivation for doing so would have been to optimized recording power laser output value and prevent reproduction error (abstract).

In regards to claims 2 and 8, Kaneko et al discloses deficiency detection by comparing a threshold value. However, Kaneko does not but Osakabe discloses wherein the threshold value is determined in accordance with an emitting power selected from a predetermined range of laser power (Fig. 9 and 10). The motivation is the same as claim 1 above.

In regards to claims 5 and 11, Kaneko et al discloses deficiency detection by comparing a threshold value. However, Kaneko et al does not but Osakabe discloses, an emitting power adjusted by the power adjusting section is composed of plural power levels (Fig. 4), and determines the threshold value in accordance with the highest power level among the plural power levels (Fig. 4, the highest power is writing power). The motivation is the same as claim 1 above.

In regards to claims 6 and 12, Kaneko et al does not but Osakabe discloses an apparatus, wherein the emitting power adjusted by the power adjusting section is composed of plural power levels (Fig. 4), determines the threshold value in accordance

Art Unit: 2627

with an erasing power level that is used for erasing among the plural power levels (Fig.

12). The motivation is the same as claim 1 above.

Allowable Subject Matter

Claims 3, 4, 9 and 10 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base

claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the

limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

In regards to claims 3 and 9, none of the reference alone or in combination

discloses a threshold value determine by an average of emitting power.

In regards to claims 4 and 10, none of the reference alone or in combination

discloses a threshold value determine by the sum of emitting power.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1 and 7 have been considered but

are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in

this Office action. Accordingly, THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. See MPEP

§ 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37

CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within Application/Control Number: 10/521,630

Art Unit: 2627

TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Page 5

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to LINH T. NGUYEN whose telephone number is (571)272-5513. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:30am-5:00pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Wayne Young can be reached on 571-272-4483. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

LN April 17, 2008

/Wayne R. Young/ Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2627